

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/832,750	CHELEHMAL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jamieson W. Fish	2616	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Pending

 (1) Jamieson W. Fish.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) William Cochran.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 28 April 2005
**Time:** 10:00 AM
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

4 and 12

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner wanted to confirm that claim 4 was intended to be dependent on claim 1 instead of canceled claim 3. The examiner also wanted to confirm that "said content provider" on line 4 of claim 12 was error. The attorney confirmed that claim 4 was indeed intended to be dependent on claim 1 and that "said content provider" should be replaced with "a video cable system provider." The following office action reflects these changes..